THE

IRISH MASSACRE

Set in a Clear Light.

WHEREIN

Mr. *Baxter*'s Account of it in the History of his own Life, and the Abridgment thereof by Dr. *Calamy*, are fully consider'd.

TOGETHER

With Two Letters from Mr. *Chaundler*, (the Diſſenting Teacher of *Bath*, Reviving the aforeſaid Account) to the Reverend Mr. *Thomas Carte* at *Bath*, with his two Replies to Mr. *Chaundler*.

LONDON:

Printed for *George Strahan*, at the *Golden-Ball*, againſt the *Royal Exchange* in *Cornhill*.

1714

IRISH
MASSACRE.

Sect in a Clear Light.

WHEREIN

Mr. Brewer's Account of it in his
History of his own Life, and the Ac
count he gives of it to the Parlia
ment, are considered.

TOGETHER

With Two Letters from Mr. Lawrence
(the Solicitor of Duke Hamilton's
Small Account) to the Reverend Mr. T.
Carte, with his two Replies to Mr. Law.

LONDON:

The Iriſh MASSACRE *ſet in a clear Light.*

I Cannot allow my ſelf to Publiſh theſe Letters to the World, without giving ſome Account of the Occaſion of writing them, which was this. Preaching on laſt *January* 30 in the *Abbey* Church of this Place, I gave in my Sermon a detail of the Methods and Practices, whereby the Rebels, of 1641 carried on their Deſigns, and effected the Ruin of the Church and Monarchy of England. 'Tis ſcarce poſſible for an honeſt Man to think of thoſe Times, and of the Meaſures then taken, without Horror, and very difficult to ſpeak of them with Tenderneſs. But the Part that I choſe was barely to repreſent them. They carried indeed their own, and that a very heavy Cenſure with them, and are ſo flagrantly impious, that nothing can, at leaſt nothing need, be added to ſet forth their Wickedneſs, or raiſe in good Men an abhorrence of them.

But what in ſuch has this Effect, raiſes a different kind of Reſentment in others: They that entertain the Principles of the Rebels of thoſe Days, and would be glad to ſee the ſame Steps purſued, the ſame Practiſes repeated, rage at a Repreſentation that makes them Odious, and may thereby prevent their Succeſs. The Preacher that expoſes theſe Practiſes, not the Perſons who committed them, is the Object of theſe Mens Indignation, and whilſt ſome pitying Expreſſions are offered up to their Memory, ſome alleviated Circumſtances urged to leſſen the Horror of their Crimes and greatneſs of their Guilt, he is ſure to feel the effects of their Paſſions, and weight of their Cenſure for ſetting in a juſt light, **Actions**, which, Execrable as they are, were yet acted many Years ago: Tho' he does this on a Day ſet apart by Authority to implore God's Pardon for thoſe very Actions, and to deprecate his Judgments which ſtill lye heavy upon this Nation on Account thereof: And though theſe very Perſons thus Diſplea-

ſed with the Remembrance of the Hypocriſy, Treachery, Rebellion, and other Impieties of a Faction, and one ſet of Men diſſenting from our Church, who once triumphed in the actual Ruin of it, and ſtill threaten it with their Attempts, can dwell for ever on all the ſhocking or unjuſtifyable Practiſes of another Body of Men, Enemies indeed to our Church, but ſo diſproportioned in Numbers, and of Principles ſo contrary to the Spirit and Genius of this Nation, and whoſe very Name is ſo odious to the Generality of even the common ſort of People, who have a ſenſe of nothing elſe; that a reaſonable Man can hardly apprehend any real Danger from them.

But Men's Actions and Cenſures are not always very conſiſtent, and 'tis no unuſual thing for them to condemn in others, that which they allow in themſelves, and to exclaim againſt that method which diſſerves their Cauſe, which they applaud when it promotes it. And if I have met with any Reproaches, or raiſed any Reſentments by a juſt Repreſentation of the Crimes and Calamities of Forty One, it has been from none but ſuch Perſons as theſe, whoſe Indignation will make none uneaſy, and it has only ſerv'd to convince me more clearly of the reaſonableneſs and uſefulneſs of ſuch a Repreſentation, which cannot ſurely by any loyal or good Man be thought improper, whilſt there are ſuch Numbers who eſpouſe the ſame Principles, with the Rebels of thoſe Days, and who, as they juſtify their Actions, may without breach of Charity, be ſuppoſed ready to Re-act them.

But it is paying too much Regard to this Objection to take Notice of it, for general Charges ſeldom need an Anſwer, and deſerve only to be ſlighted. And yet nothing more Particular has been objected againſt that Diſcourſe, no Miſrepreſentation has been charged on it, as to any one Fact aſſerted in it, unleſs as to that which Mr. *Chandler* the diſſenting Teacher in this Place was offended at, and challenged me to prove, which as it gave Occaſion for, makes alſo the Subject of the following Letters.

It cannot therefore be improper to lay before the World that

that Paſſage which he excepted againſt, in the Words wherein I Preach'd it; of which take this Account.

After ſhewing the Reaſonableneſs of the Religious Obſervance of the Day from ſeveral Topicks, as particularly, from its being a proper means to obtain God's Pardon for the horrid Murder committed on it, the fatal Effects of which, and Calamities naturally flowing from it, this Nation has long groaned under, and cannot yet ſee an End of; from the Encouragement which the ſeditious Doctrines that ſupported the Great Rebellion have met with of late Years, from the Profanation of the Day by a Crew of Wretches at their Calves-Head-Feaſts, from the little or no Alteration in the Principles and Conduct of the Sects and Parties, the Great Actors in the Rapines and Crimes of thoſe Rebellious Times, that has appeared ſince where they have the Power of Acting, from the barbarous Treatment of the Epiſcopal Clergy in a Siſter Nation ſince the Revolution, a Thing too little known and conſidered in this, and from the Diſſenters looking on the ſolemn League and Covenant, that Grand Inſtrument of the Rebellion as ſtill obligatory on the Nation. I after this, obſerved, how carefully they are taught to abhor the Memory of the Royal Martyr, as Mr. *Weſley* who was bred up amongſt them, tells us in his Account of the Manner of Education in the Diſſenting Academies, and laid it down for a Rule, that their Actions are the Trueſt Teſt of their Sentiments in this Point, and the ſureſt way we can take to form a judgment of them: And then immediately follow theſe Words, *&c.*

And do not theſe (their Actions) ſhew, that they hate the Memory of King *Charles* to the utmoſt degree, and that they rejoyce in their Anceſtors Treatment of him, and tranſcribe their Copy as far as they can? Thoſe, we know, not ſatisfy'd with ſpoiling the Royal Martyr of his Kingdom and Life, endeavoured to ſtab his Honour, which was dearer to him than both. Among other Slanders which their Malice threw upon him, and his Memory, this was one,

that He had an hand in, and gave Orders for the Bloody Maſſacre and Rebellion in *Ireland* in 1641.

The Malice and Falſhood of this Charge have been ſufficiently proved, and 'tis well known and atteſted, that when Sir *Phelim Oneal*, Head of that Rebellion, was taken, they endeavoured to perſwade him to accuſe the King, and at his Tryal, nay, at his Execution too, they offered him his Life, his Eſtate and other Advantages, would he but charge the King with it. This was a Crime ſo horrid, that tho' themſelves were Villains enough to engage in it, yet Sir *Phelim* would not, but dyed declaring the King's Innocency. And yet this Curſed as well as Falſe and Malicious Calumny their Sons have revived again within theſe Eight Years in the Abridgment of *Baxter*'s Life publiſhed by *Calamy*.

I inſiſted likewiſe, by way of Proof of this their Hatred of King *Charles*'s Memory, on the Malicious, tho' Impotent, Endeavors, uſed to make the Εἰκὼν Βασιλικὴ, that Book of his, which contains the True Picture of his Soul, and this ſo exceeding Lovely and Beautiful an one, that it muſt charm all that have any Taſte of Virtue and Goodneſs, be ſuſpected as ſpurious; and on the late Republiſhing of all the Lies and Slanders that had been raiſed of him, and ſpreading them through the Nation in *Ludlow*'s Memoirs. And whether Mr. *Chandler* has by his Conduct contributed any thing to the clearing of them from ſuch an hatred of King *Charles*'s Memory, let the World judge.

What I am further to ſay with regard to this Paſſage is, that as it is the only One, the Truth of which has been called in Queſtion, and which Mr. *Chandler* has choſe for the Subject of his Attack, ſo I have quoted it fairly to a Syllable as I preach'd it.

I muſt confeſs, I did not imagine that a Clergy-man of the Church of *England*, Preaching on ſuch a Day, ſetting forth the Horror of thoſe Crimes, which occaſioned the Obſervance of it, and vindicating one of the beſt but moſt Abuſed Monarchs that ever lived, ſhould be called to an Account by a Diſſenting Teacher, for what he ſaid from the Pulpit,

Pulpit, in the Execution of his Office, in ſo juſt, at leaſt ſo charitable a Cauſe, and in anſwering the Ends for which the Supreme Authority of the Nation enjoyned the Obſervance of the Day; ſuch a Conduct as this ſeeming to be no very ſuitable Return for that Toleration which our Laws have graciouſly indulg'd the Diſſenters, was what indeed I did not expect. Much leſs could I expect an Attack on a Point of ſo odious a Nature, as the Loading King *Charles*'s Memory with ſo black a Crime, as being concern'd in the *Iriſh Maſſacre*: And the World perhaps will be ſurprized to find any ſo Malignant now, as to ſuſpect it poſſible for him to be guilty of ſo deteſtable an Action, from which he has been ſo clearly vindicated, and which never had any the leaſt Proof to ſupport it.

That a Calumny of ſo groſs a ſize ſhould be charg'd upon King *Charles*, and a particular Diſproof of it required, one of his Race ſitting upon the Throne, in a Place of as publick Reſort as any in this Kingdom; a Calumny which the Rebels of 41 could never fix or prove upon him, tho' they uſed all Arts to do it, tho' People were put to the Rack to oblige them to Accuſe him as * privy to, and concern'd in the *Iriſh* Rebellion, as was the Caſe of Sir *John Read*: and tho' at the time of its firſt being charged upon him, it was undeniably refuted by Mr. *Howell* and others: None of the *Iriſh* Rebels that fell into the Hands of the Parliament Offering to accuſe him of it; and the Lord *Macguire* than whom none was deeper engaged in that Rebellion, or knew more of the Perſons concern'd, and of the Meaſures to be taken in it, He, (as the King ſays in his Declaration in Anſwer to the Parliaments Reſolution of no farther Addreſſes. fol. 289.) Tho' thus equally privy to all Tranſactions, denyed to the laſt, that the Rebels had any Commiſſion from the King, with more ſenſe of Conſcience, than they who examined him expected: Tho' he was ſo far from

---

* Lord *Caſtlehaven*'s Memoirs. p. 39.

giving

giving them any Commiſſion, that he had no foreknowledge of their Deſign, as, (ſays Mr. *Howel* in his Glance on the *Iſle* of *Wight*. p. 381.) beſides a World of convincing Circumſtances which may clear him in this particular, appears from the Confeſſion of the ſame Lord *Macguire* before his Execution on *Feb.* 20. 1644, who upon the Ladder, and another upon the Scaffold, when they were ready to breath their laſt, and to appear before the Tribunal of Heaven, did abſolutely acquit the King in this point; and this ſpontaneouſly of their own accord, being unſought unto, but only out of a Love to Truth and diſcharge of a good Conſcience: Nay, ſo far was he from having any Intimation of the Inſurrection in *Ireland*, that as Mr. *Howel* atteſts,* the Spaniſh Ambaſſador here and his Confeſſor, a very Reverend *Iriſhman* told him, the King knew no more of it than the Great *Mogul* did; and ſo confident was Mr. *Howel* † of his Innocence in this reſpect, that he dared to pawn his Soul on the Truth of it; that ſuch a Calumny as this, ſo clearly refuted on it's firſt Appearance in the World ſhould be now publiſhed afreſh, and a particular Diſproof of it required at this diſtance of time, when the Revivers of the Charge might hope that all Evidence to confront it was wanting, is indeed ſurprizing, but it is withal very unfair Treatment of that excellent Prince on whom the Charge is laid, and is ſuch a Method of arguing againſt Fact, that if it be allowed, there is no point in Hiſtory ſo well atteſted but it may be diſputed. And yet ſuch a Diſproof is what Mr. *Chandler* has thought fit to inſiſt on, and demand from me as neceſſary for the clearing of the King. The Words of his firſt Letter are,

---

* Italian Perſpective p. 289. † Land of *Ireland* p. 217.

For Mr. Cart.

Bath Feb. 2d. 17$\frac{13}{14}$.

Sir,

WHereas I am inform'd by ſome that heard you laſt *Saturday*, that you ſhould ſay, that the charging King *Charles* I. with being Acceſſary to the Iriſh Maſſacre, was a thing that had been ſufficiently diſproved. I take the Liberty to deſire you would be pleaſed to let me know in what Author I may find that, for I proteſt I ſhould be heartily glad to find it. In Juſtice to the Memory of the Royal Martyr, in Juſtice to your ſelf and in Charity to me, you ſtand bound to do ſo much for one that from his Heart abhors the Doctrines of King-killing and Country Enſlaving, and is Sir,

Your humble Servant

Henry Chandler.

I Received it at 4 in the Afternoon on Tueſday *Feb.* 2d. and read the Contents not without Wonder, that, whilſt the Roman Catholicks, who ſeem to have the ſtrongeſt Temptations in point of Intereſt, and for the Credit of their Religion, to charge the King with giving them a Commiſſion, do (as Lord *Caſtlehaven*, *Procurator Walſh*, *F. D'Orleans* and other of their Writers) notwithſtanding this, clear him of it, and ingeniouſly own the Inſurrection to be a Rebellion, which it could not have been, had they the King's Commiſſion to warrant them; whilſt Truth forces this Confeſſion from them. Any, who call themſelves Proteſtants, and pretend to a greater Purity and more Religion than others, who are called by that general Name, ſhould allow themſelves in a Practice which thoſe abhor, ſhould dare to repeat the horrid Slander on the King and demand a particular Diſproof of it.

One might at leaſt expect that this ſhould be done with Modeſty, or with the appearance of it, and that, whilſt the

Action

Action it ſelf might raiſe a Clamour and (what is more) deſerve it, yet there might be ſomething in the Manner in the circumſtances of the Action to recommend it, and procure it a fairer Reception in the World. But it is the Fate of Error to be Confident, and a bad Cauſe ſeldom ſuffers for want of Zeal, a thing very neceſſary to ſupport it, where Truth and Juſtice are abſent. Such was the Caſe and Conduct of Mr. *Chandler*. Not ſatisfyed with writing to me a Letter he fancy'd I could not anſwer; he ſpread it about with an Induſtry, that Prudence would not have ſuffered him to uſe, had he not been ſure of Victory, nor Charity have allowed him in, whatever his Perſuaſions were, without much better Evidence for them, than he has yet produced in the Diſpute. He ſhew'd it to an Alderman of this City, who ſpake of it publickly at a place where the Members of the Corporation met at Dinner, on *Thurſday Feb.* 4th. He ſent Copies of it to Shops to be given away *gratis*, that the King's Reproach, and the Credit his Performance was to gain himſelf, might be ſpread the wider, and made as Publick as poſſible. Three of them were the ſame Day, at Mr. *Harford*'s Shop in the Church Yard, put into the Hand of a Perſon, who after Evening Service aſſured me of this particular Fact, and in general, of the multitude of Copies diſperſed abroad.

Such Confidence and Zeal in ſo bad a Cauſe did not more ſurprize, than ſeem to upbraid me for the want thereof in a good one, and obliged me without the leaſt Delay, to finiſh my firſt Letter to Mr. *Chandler*, which I had begun the Day before, and ſent to him that Evening, and is as follows.

For Mr. Chandler.

Bath Feb. 3. $17\frac{13}{14}$.

Sir,

YEſterday I received from you a Letter, wherein you tell me that you are inform'd by ſome who heard me laſt

laſt Saturday, that I ſhould ſay that the charging King *Charles* I. with being Acceſſory to the Iriſh Maſſacre was a thing that had been ſufficiently diſproved.

You have not in this point been miſinformed: I did ſay, that the Malice as well as Falſhood of that Charge have been ſufficiently proved: And I had reaſon for ſaying ſo: Reaſon indeed ſo clear that I thought none could have been really ignorant, either of that Bleſſed Prince's Innocence, or of the Evidences whereby it is proved.

But ſince, it ſeems, you are, and therefore require me to tell you, in what Author you may find it; I do now, in Anſwer to your Demand, and to give you the Satisfaction you want in this Matter, refer you to Dr. *Nalſon*'s Collections (a Book to be met with at Mr. *Hammond*'s) Vol. 2. pag. 528, 529, 530. Where you may, in the Depoſition of Dr. *Ker* Dean of *Ardagh*, ſee Sir *Phelim Oneal* clearing the King from this unjuſt Calumny, and declaring, that he could not in Conſcience charge the King with it, tho' he had been frequently ſollicited thereto by fair Promiſes and Great Rewards, while he was in Priſon. You may ſee Sir *Phelim* every Day of his Tryal aſſerting the King's Innocency, rejecting the Judges offers of reſtoring him to his Eſtate and Liberty, in Caſe he could bring Proof that he had any Commiſſion from the King for the levying of War, and proving in the moſt ſatisfactory manner, that the Commiſſion, which he had formerly pretended to have received from him, was drawn by his (Sir *Phelim*'s) own Orders, and the Broad Seal fixed to it, was taken from a Patent of the Lord *Caulfield*'s found in the Caſtle of *Charlemount*; which Mr. *Harriſon* (the Man who took the Seal from the Patent and fixed it to the Commiſſion) likewiſe atteſts. You may ſee Offers of Mercy made to Sir *Phelim* at his Execution upon the barbarous Condition of falſly accuſing King *Charles* in that Point; and may likewiſe ſee him under all the Terrors of Death, and the ſtrongeſt Temptations Man could lie under, bravely atteſting that Prince's Innocency, and ſealing the Truth of his Teſtimony with his Blood.

Read the whole and then conſider, whether your Demand is not effectually anſwered, and whether any thing can more clearly diſprove that (as far as I have heard) only pretence of the Charge againſt the King, or ſhew at once more evidently, the

conſummate Wickedneſs of that Party, which accuſed him of ſo horrid a Crime, and their Inability to make good their Charge.

Both theſe are ſtill farther cleared by what Sir *Roger Manley* ſays, in his Hiſtory of the Rebellions in *England*, *Scotland*, and *Ireland*, printed at *London*, 1691. Where, after giving an Account of King *Charles*'s cauſing the Marqueſs of *Ormond* to deliver *Dublin*, then (*A. D.* 1646.) beſieged by the Iriſh Army by Land, and block'd up by the Parliament Ships on the Sea Side, into the Hands of the Parliamentarian Rebels, rather than the Iriſh: And after briefly reciting Sir *Phelim Oneal*'s Atteſtation of that King's Innocency, he expreſſes himſelf in theſe Words, *p.* 90. Nor was it only with him (Sir *Phelim*) but with ſeveral other Priſoners, that they moſt impiouſly endeavoured by Promiſes of Life, Liberty and Eſtate, and no leſs abominable Artifices, to ſooth them to Confeſſions that might entitle the King to that Nefarious Rebellion.

Can the moſt prejudiced Perſon read this, without being convinced as well of that good Prince's perfect Innocence, as of the exquiſite Malice of his Enemies.

You needed not then to have preſs'd me in ſo ſolemn a manner, to produce my Vouchers for what I ſaid, or have challeng'd me to do it, as I was bound by the very ſtrict Obligations of Juſtice to the Royal Martyr and my ſelf, as well as of Charity to you. I ſhould have gratify'd you in your Deſire on leſs Inducements, and given you that Proof which probably you did not expect, and which I hope may be to your Conviction: And tho' you have hitherto laboured under a ſo very rare and almoſt ſingular Misfortune, as not to have met with any Author, that has cleared the King from being acceſſory to the Iriſh Maſſacre, (tho' there is ſcarce an Hiſtorian that writes of thoſe times, but clears him) and have never found that it has been ſufficiently diſproved; yet that now you will own the Falſehood of the Charge, or let me know what you will be pleaſed to allow as a ſufficient Diſproof of it.

I have ſhewn you, where it is (as any rational unprejudiced Perſon muſt think) ſufficiently diſproved: Tho' I might with better Reaſon have demanded of you, where it

was ever proved. This ſhould have been done before a Vindication could be neceſſary, and it was reaſonable to expect it: Since Matters of Fact, as they are too ſtubborn to allow of tedious Cavils, are withal plain enough to admit of an eaſy Proof. And yet what Proof can be brought for the Charge? None that deſerves the Name, or would be allowed the Authority of a Teſtimony in the moſt trifling Inſtance; and therefore certainly ought not to be allowed in the Caſe before us, againſt a Perſon in the higheſt Station, and for a Charge of the blackeſt Nature, in proportion whereto the Proof ought to be the clearer.

Lord *Clarendon* (Hiſtory of the Rebellion. *vol.* 1. *Book* 4. *p.* 238.) ſays, It is a Calumny without the leaſt Shadow or Colour of Truth. And when we conſider its Inconſiſtency, with the general Character of that Bleſſed Prince, and more particularly with that extraordinary Tenderneſs and Compaſſion of Nature, which was remarkable in him, and which (ſays Lord *Clarendon*'s Hiſtory, *vol.* 3. *Book* 11. *p.* 197.) reſtrained him from ever doing an hard hearted thing; with his Sentiments in point of Religion and Zeal, for the Conſtitution of the Church of *England*, for which he dyed a Martyr; with the whole Conduct and in a manner every Action of his Life; with his moſt ſolemn Profeſſions and Appeals to God, who knew his Heart; (ſee his Εἰκὼν Βασιλικὴ *c.* 12.) nay, and with his very Intereſts too; for he never recovered the Diſadvantages, which the very charging of this Calumny brought upon him; and that it had for its Support the weakeſt Foundation imaginable, the Pretence only of Rebels, who would be glad at any rate to make the beſt of their Cauſe, and might get a Broad Seal in a way eaſy to be accounted for, and which every charitable Man's Thoughts would ſoon ſuggeſt to him: Can we think that any Man, who was very willing to believe it true, could eaſily receive a Charge of ſuch a Nature, or demand a particular Diſproof of what was never proved, and is ſo improbable in every Reſpect?

Tho' therefore ſuch a Diſproof be not in it ſelf neceſſary, I have nevertheleſs in Compliance with your Deſire, and in Obedience to thoſe Obligations you tell me, I lie under to do ſo much for you, laid it before you. And

And now let me add, that the ſame Conſiderations of Juſtice and Charity require you now to uſe your Endeavours to vindicate the Royal Martyr from this Calumny. You cannot but know how it has been revived within theſe few Years; and with how degenerous and baſe a Spirit, with how bitter a Rancour, a Rancour reaching even beyond the Grave, which puts a Period to common Hatreds, ſome have trampled on the Aſhes of that Bleſſed Prince, and the Calumny probably has found Belief with many.

And ſince it is the Duty of every one (as he has Ability and Opportunity) to do Right to the injured; I hope, it will be your Buſineſs to undeceive all that you know labour under ſo unjuſt and uncharitable a Miſtake. Such a Meaſure of Juſtice may ſurely be expected from one, who profeſſes to abhor from his Heart the Doctrine of King killing. I would fain perſwade my ſelf, that in this you know your own Heart, a thing, which as it is deceitful above all things, often deceives a Mans ſelf; and that you would not take up Arms and fight in the Field againſt your Prince, and uſe your Sword to ſlay him there whom you would not murder ſolemnly and deliberately out of it; and that by the Doctrines of Country enſlaving you do not deſign in the uſe of that Term, to throw a Reflection on any Doctrine of Chriſtianity, or to repreſent the Duties of Paſſive Obedience and Non-Reſiſtance, (Duties which Primitive Chriſtianity practiſed under the greateſt Trials, and which the Church of *England* has gloried in) in an odious as well as falſe Light. For if you do, be aſſured that your Pretences to abhor from your Heart the Doctrine of King killing are vain, whilſt you only boggle at a particular manner of doing the Act; and you would do well to conſider, whether a Duty, which is enjoined by the Laws of the Land can deſerve this Character of Country Enſlaving, and what he deſerves that gives it.

I am Sir

Your Humble Servant

Tho. Carte.

To what I ſay of Sir *Phelim Oneal* in this Letter, I can't think it neceſſary to add any thing unleſs it be one

Remark

Remark out of an Account of his Trial, which I have now before me, and have often heard from a very worthy Clergyman, who was born in *Ireland* before the time of the Trial, and whoſe Uncle, from whom he had the Relation, was preſent at it in the Chancery Court of *Dublin*, where the High Court of Juſtice ſate, the Commiſſioners whereof were directed by a Committee, that ſate in an adjoining Room, called the Chancery Chamber, what Queſtions they ſhould propoſe to *Oneal*; a Communication being kept up by means of a Meſſenger who went conſtantly between them, and repreſented to the Committee all Proceedings in the Court, and brought Inſtructions to the Commiſſioners on every Occaſion, ſpeaking to them thro' a ſquare Hole in the Wall; and the Remark is this, that Sir *Phelim* ſeems to appear in the Court with a Remorſe for the Sins of his Life and the Blood he had ſhed in the Rebellion, and with an unfeigned deſire of waſhing away the Guilt of his former Crimes by a ſincere Repentance of them. And therefore when the Commiſſioners, whoſe barbarous endeavors to extort from him an Accuſation of the King, during the courſe of his Trial, (which was drawn out to the length of ſeveral Days, that he might be work'd upon in that time, he had reſiſted with a Conſtancy, that could hardly be expected in his Circumſtances, owning that he had ſhew'd a Commiſſion, but it was of his own Drawing, he having been bred in the Inns of Court in *England* and the Broad Seal fixed to it, as above related; when they preſs'd him to plead this Commiſſion as given him by the King, he anſwered, that he would not increaſe his Crimes by accuſing an innocent Man who was Dead, herein ſhewing a Remorſe that juſtly upraids the impenitence of thoſe Fanatick Regicides who ſuffered here in *England*, and ſuch a regard to Truth and Juſtice, and concern for the Honour of an injured Prince, that we have Reaſon to wiſh a ſort of Proteſtants among us would imitate.

On *Feb.* 5. in the Morning I received from Mr. *Chandler* the following Letter.

For

For Mr. Thomas Carte.

Bath Feb. 4. 17$\frac{13}{14}$.

Sir,

YOurs I juſt now receiv'd. I thank you for the favour of a Reply to mine of the 2d. Inſtant. You may aſſure your ſelf, if it had contributed in the leaſt to my ſatisfaction, I ſhould not have diſſembled it. But it does not touch upon the matter, that occaſioned my giving you the Trouble of my firſt Writing to you, which was your Reflecting upon Mr. *Baxter* (and Dr. *Calamy* his Abridger) with reſpect unto the Buſineſs of the Marqueſs of *Antrim*. A Story Printed in Mr. *Baxter*'s Life near Eighteen Years ago, and which, if it has been proved to be falſe, I proteſt I have been ſo unhappy as not to have met with that Proof, which Proof (if ſuch there be) I declare in the Preſence of God, I will heartily thank you for directing me to, and this, whatever you think, I think a ſufficient Reply to yours.

I am Sir

Your Humble Servant

Hen. Chandler.

HE calls this a Reply to my Letter, tho' it takes not the leaſt notice of any one thing ſaid in it, and refers me to a Story, which I never heard, and which being founded on the Conduct of a Private Man, might, at the diſtance of 70 Years from the Time of his Actings be hard to be confuted, or if it was to be ſet in a True Light, yet the doing this would require more time than I had to ſpare, and greater pains than my Conſtitution was able to bear.

On theſe Accounts, many who have the juſteſt Regard to the Royal Martyr's Honour, thought it not proper for me to engage further in the Diſpute, or at leaſt, that it was not neceſſary to clear a Story whoſe falſhood might ſufficiently appear to all unprejudiced Perſons, by it's attacking a Character ſo well eſtabliſhed as His. But being enter'd upon the Controverſy, and challeng'd in particular to clear this Story, being made ſenſible of the Prejudices whereby many were drawn aſide to believe the horrid charge againſt him, their Confidence in the Truth of this Story, the only pretence left to uphold the Charge, and the Triumphs that would enſue a neglect of refuting it, and being

ing likewiſe verily perſuaded that every Member of that Church, for whoſe Cauſe he dyed a Martyr, owes more to the Memory, the Remains of King *Charles*, than a bare hazard of his Health, I reſolved, notwithſtanding the precariouſneſs of that and the Buſineſs of the Place, to ſet about refuting it: And after reading over all the Hiſtories, Pamphlets and Accounts that I could procure, relating to the Iriſh Rebellion, and the Conduct of Perſons during the continuance of it. I drew up the following Letter at thoſe Hours which I could borrow from the Night, and as it has been thought to contain a clear Vindication of King *Charles*, from the Aſperſions thrown upon Him in the Story which gave occaſion to it, I now publiſh it to the World without any Alteration.

For Mr. Chandler. *Bath Feb.* 19. 17$\frac{1}{2}$.

Sir,

I Received yours on the 4th Inſtant, in which you tell me that my Letter of the 3d has not contributed in the leaſt to your Satisfaction, ſo that (it ſhould ſeem) the black Charge againſt King *Charles* I. of his being acceſſary to the *Iriſh* Maſſacre is ſtill in poſſeſſion of you, and is not, in your Opinion, ſufficiently diſproved. It would have been ſome ſatisfaction to me, had you told me what you will be pleaſed to allow as a ſufficient Diſproof of it, and what will give you any degree of Satisfaction in this Point. But inſtead of doing this (as I preſs'd you to do) you, without taking any Notice of what I urged, think it a ſufficient Juſtification of that very hard Opinion you have entertained of King *Charles*, to refer me to (what you call) the Buſineſs of the Marqueſs of *Antrim*. This you do without telling me, that you'll be ſatisfied if I clear that matter, ſo that I am ſtill at a loſs to know what farther kind of diſproof you expect, or when your Scruples will end.

However, to remove (if poſſible) your Prejudices, and to lay before you thoſe Evidences and Reaſons, which every rational and impartial Man muſt allow to be ſufficient for Conviction: I ſhall add ſome Conſiderations to what I urged in my former, and then anſwer that Story which you lay ſo much ſtreſs upon in your laſt.

I have

I have already repreſented to you that the Charge has been never proved, that it is wanting both in external and intrinſick Evidence, that it is inconſiſtent with the King's Character and Conduct on many Accounts, and that the Rebels pretences to a Commiſſion from him, have been in the moſt unexceptionable manner refuted by Sir *Phelim Oneal*. Let me now, to make thoſe appear in a juſter as well as clearer Light, deſire you to conſider whether *Fleetwood*, *Ludlow*, and the reſt of that Factious Crew, who had a ſhare in the Government of *Ireland* at the time of Sir *Phelim*'s * Tryal (*Feb.* 1652) would ever have taken ſo baſe and execrable a Method to ſtain the King's Honour, and faſten that horrid charge upon him, had they had any real grounds for it, and whether their acting thus and their diſappointment in the impious attempt, muſt not be looked upon by all ſober and good Men, as an irrefragable proof of the King's Innocency, which notwithſtanding all the Arts and Endeavours, the Promiſes and Threats, the Severities and Rewards, the Bribes and Temptations, which the Power and Wealth of the Nation could enable them to uſe, with the Perſons they ſollicited to accuſe him, could ſtand the Teſt of them all, and bear up with ſo glorious a ſucceſs againſt the utmoſt Efforts and Aſſaults, that the moſt powerful Wickedneſs, Malice and Cunning could make againſt it. Had the King been indeed Guilty, leſs Induſtry, honeſter Methods, fewer Temptations, weaker Inducements would have proved his Guilt, whereas nothing but the pureſt Innocence, and beſt eſtabliſh'd Truth, could ſtand firm in ſuch Trials as this, and againſt all Attempts that ſuch Enemies could make. It was the force of this Truth, which extorted not only from Sir *Phelim* in particular, but from the Rebels in general, from the Commanders as well as Fryars, a Confeſſion that they had no Commiſſion at all from the King, but (as Dr. * *Robert Maxwell* afterwards Biſhop of *Kilmore* depoſed upon Oath *Aug.* 22. 1642) that they thought it lawful to pretend what they could in Advancement of their Cauſe, and that in all Wars, Rumours and Lies ſerved many times to as good purpoſe as Arms, and that they would not diſclaim any Advantage. It

* Borlace p. 302, 304. * Borlace Appendix. p. 126.

It could be nothing elſe but the force of Truth that extorted this Confeſſion from Rebels, who (as appears from the Teſtimonies of Dr. *Maxwell*, and another Gentleman who was Priſoner amongſt them, both examined upon Oath) * were deſirous to raiſe up againſt the King as many Enemies, and throw on him all the Odium that they could; and who hated him to ſuch a degree, that ſome of them, and they of Note among them have ſaid, That † if they had his Majeſty in their Power, they would Flea him Alive: Others, that they would give a great Sum of Money to have his Head, that however they would have the Kingdom and their Will of him; that they would have an *Iriſh* King, and regarded not King *Charles* the King of *England*: That they had a New King and had Commiſſion from him for what they did; and that they would not be contented with the Conqueſt of *Ireland* alone, but would drive King *Charles* with his whole Poſterity out of *England*, || ſo that he and his Poſterity ſhould be afterwards *Profagi in Terra Aliena in æternum*, Wanderers in a Foreign Land for ever, a Work, which they thro' Impotence left to that Factious Race (whoſe inconſiſtent Malice would pretend that the King ſhould give his Commiſſion to thoſe who hated him thus outragiouſly, the better thereby to enable them to execute their Deſigns againſt himſelf, and to deprive him of his Kingdom and Life) by a more Succeſsful Rebellion to proſecute, and in too great a Meaſure accompliſh.

To mention a publick Act of the whole Body of Rebels, which evidently ſhews their want of any Commiſſion or Countenance from his Majeſty. The * Preamble of their Remonſtrance delivered (by the Lord Viſcount *Gormanſton*, Sir *Lucas Dillon*, and Sir *Robert Talbot* to the King's Commiſſioners, who were authoriſed to hear their Propoſals) at *Trim* in the

* *See Letter from the Lords Juſtices and Council to King* Charles, *dated* March 26. 1642. † R. Cox *Append.* 4. p. 6. 7. &c. || Ruſhworth, *Abridged, Vol.* 4. p. 190. * Nalſon, *Vol.* 2. p. 528. *Sir* R. Cox *Append.* 5. p. 15.

County of *Meath*, *March* 17. 1642. quotes thoſe Words of his Majeſty out of his Commiſſion to hear what they had to ſay, in † which he expreſſes his utter Deteſtation of that odious Rebellion, which the Recuſants of *Ireland* had without ground or colour raiſed againſt him, his Crown and Dignity. Words ſpoke not in a Corner, but under the Great Seal of *England*, and even in that Commiſſion which thoſe falſe Accuſers were to ſee and hear read, Words that ſtung them to the Heart, which the King would not have uſed, had he not been perfectly Innocent, nor they have born had they been leſs Guilty, and which ſufficiently provoked them to plead that Authority which they had ſo falſly pretended, had they had the leaſt Shadow for ſo black a Calumny, and yet they qnote them without pretending in the leaſt to the King's Approbation of their Rebellion, and with an Acknowledgment of his real Abhorrence thereof, which Abhorrence therefore they uſe their utmoſt endeavours to remove.

Theſe things, one would think, might be ſufficient to prove the King's Innocency, and to ſhew the falſhood of all Pretences to a Commiſſion from him: But this will farther appear if we conſider that the granting a Commiſſion or Authority in the Caſe before us to any Perſon whatſoever, is contrary

1. To the Publick * and Authentick Acts of the King himſelf and Lords Juſtices, to the Proclamations of *October* 30, of *Jan.* 1. and *Feb.* 8. 1641. Acts of ſuch a Nature as to vacate, or at leaſt to render uſeleſs all Commiſſions inconſiſtent with them, and granted in a Clandeſtine way if any could be ſo uncharitable as to ſuppoſe that the King would grant any for the Crimes of Rapine, Murder and Rebellion, or ſo ſenſeleſs as to imagine that he would grant it for no End, or for one that it could ſerve but a Day, or (ſtrictly ſpeaking) but a Week.

2. To

---

† *Earl of* Orrery's *Anſwer to* W. p. 29. * Borlace, p. 53. 34. 65. 30. *Append.* 3. p. 21. 6. p. 27.

2. To the King's ſurpriſe at the breaking out of the Rebellion, expreſs'd in his Letter to the * Marqueſs of *Ormond*, wrote from *Edenburgh*, *October* 31. 1641. and to his care in improving every hint and Intelligence he receiv'd of Ill and Seditious Deſigns, for preventing them, ſee his Letter wrote by his Order to the Juſtices of *Ireland*, *March* 16. 1640.

3. To his Profeſſions of having had ſince the beginning of that monſtrous Rebellion no greater Sorrow than for the bleeding Condition of the Kingdom of *Ireland*, and of his being grieved from the very Soul at the Calamities of his good Subjects there.

4. To his repeated ſolemn Appeals to God, and calling him to Witneſs for the Truth and Sincerity of his Profeſſions.

5. To his whole Conduct and Actions, to his Zealous Endeavours and uſe of all means in his Power, that timely Relief might be ſent over to the Succour of the diſtreſs'd Proteſtants; to his leaving the Management of the War there to the Parliament, and parting with his Prerogative, already ſufficiently pared, that if poſſible to move them by ſuch a Sacrifice, it might be carryed on the better; to his conſenting to all Propoſitions (how diſadvantagious ſoever to himſelf) that were offered him for that purpoſe, to his ſending over immediately, on the firſt News of the Inſurrection of the Rebels, 1500 Men to oppoſe them, and ſending afterwards Arms and Ammunition in ſuch Proportion and Quantities, and at ſuch times as he could very ill ſpare them; to his inflexible Reſolution (even after the fatal Battle of *Naſeby*) when his Affairs ſeem'd deſperate, that if the Condition of them were ſtill more deſperate, he would never redeem them by any Conceſſions to the *Iriſh* Re-

 bels

* *Sir* R. Cox. *Append.* 49. Ruſhworth *Abridgment. vol.* 3. p. 168.

bels that muſt wound his Honour and Conſcience, and that let his Circumſtances be what they would, * he would run any extremity, rather than do the leaſt Act that might hazard the Religion of the Church of *England*, in which, and for which he was reſolved to live and dye; and to his Orders ſent from Time to Time to the Marqueſs of *Ormond*, in regard to which, that Marqueſs expreſſes himſelf (in his Anſwer to the Addreſs of Thanks from the Two Houſes of Parliament in *Ireland*, for the Preſervation of themſelves and the reſt of the Proteſtant Party there, thro' his Care and Providence, *March* 17. 1646-7) ſo fully as to prevent all Cavils that may be raiſed on Account of any Particulars thereof, and gives ſo remarkable an Atteſtation of the Juſtice, Goodneſs and Piety of them, that I ſhall here ſet down his Words, which are theſe, *viz. And now, my Lords and Gentlemen, ſince this perhaps may be the laſt Time that I ſhall have Honour to ſpeak to you from this Place; and ſince that next to the Words of a dying Man, thoſe of one ready to baniſh himſelf from his Country, for the good of it, challenge credit; Give me leave before God and you here to proteſt, that in all the time I had the Honour to ſerve the King my Maſter, I never received any Command from him, but ſuch as ſpake him a Wiſe, Pious Proteſtant Prince, Zealous of the Religion he profeſſeth, the welfare of his Subjects, and induſtrious to promote and ſettle Peace and Tranquillity in all his Kingdoms, and I ſhall beſeech you to look no otherwiſe upon me than upon a ready Inſtrument ſet on work by the King's Wiſdom and Good for your Preſervation.*

To not only what he did, but what he would farther have done; To his unfeigned offers of venturing in his own Perſon all the dangers of War, of hazarding his very Life for the defence of his Proteſtant Subjects in *Ireland*, and for the chaſtiſement of thoſe perfidious and barbarous Rebels (as he Stiles them,) and of pawning or even ſelling his own Parks, Lands, and Houſes for this Service.

To not only his conſtant Expreſſions of Abhorrence of that Rebellion,

---

† *Sir* Robert Cox, part 2, Chap. 1, p. 152.

Rebellion, but alſo to his denying all knowledge of it, with the ſtrongeſt Aſſeverations, and Declarations of his Deteſtation of it to ſuch a degree as to vow that if his own Son had an hand in it, he would cut off his Head.

To this Conſideration likewiſe, which alone (ſays Sir *R. Cox*) muſt convince all Mankind of the King's Innocence in this Affair, and that is, that an *Iriſh* Rebellion was the moſt unlucky and fatal thing that could happen to His Majeſty at that Juncture, it broke all his Meaſures, and was ſo evidently againſt his Intereſt, that no body could ſuſpect him to contrive it, that does not at the ſame time think he was Mad.

You need but look into the King's firſt and other Meſſages to the Parliament about the Affairs of *Ireland*, particularly that of *April* 8, 1642. His anſwer to a Petition preſented to him at *York*, *April* 8, 1642. by the Earl of *Stamford* and others in the Name of both Houſes; His Anſwer to the Petition of the Proteſtant Committee for *Ireland*, *December* 1, 1642. and into Sir *Robert Cox*'s *Apparatus* to the 2d part of his *Hibernia Anglicana*, to ſee every particular of theſe evidently proved to you.

And yet theſe are ſuch Contradictions as I hope there are very few of ſo keen and unreaſonable a Malice towards King *Charles* as to ſwallow them for the gratifying it; and if conſider'd as they ought, together with the univerſal confeſſion of the Rebels, in not only ſingle Perſons, but in a Body, that they had no Commiſſion from him, and with the other points I have inſiſted on, muſt be look'd upon by all impartial and good Men as a ſufficient diſproof of the Charge againſt that Prince, as ſuch a Vindication of his Innocence that nothing but the directeſt Teſtimony ſhould make him ever ſuſpected, as a Defence of him too ſtrong to be beat down by ſuch weak Attacks, as are made againſt it in the ſtory of the Marqueſs of *Antrim*, which I am now to conſider, and which, you tell me, was the occaſion of your writing to me your firſt Letter.

Had

---

† *Sir* Robert Cox, *Hiſt.* Ireland, Apparat. 10. *part* 2.

Had you told me this before, it might have been anſwered in my former, but I cannot divine, and that Letter has not a word of the Story, a Story which (as far as I can remember) I never heard of before. It is indeed printed in Mr. *Baxter*'s Life, but that is a Book that I never ſaw till laſt Week. It was not touched upon in my Sermon, on *January* 30, wherein I only inſiſted on Sir *Phelim Oneal*'s clearing the King at his Tryal and Execution, the truth of which I therefore thought you queſtioned in your firſt Letter.

And as for Dr. *Calamy*'s Abridgment of Mr. *Baxter*'s Life; that is a Book I never read, nor indeed did ever meet with, except once, betwixt 2 or 3 Years ago, at the Houſe of a worthy Friend, with whom I had then ſome diſcourſe about the Revival, which ſome People have of late Years made, (with what deſign they know, and honeſt Men fear) of all the Calumnies that have been ever thrown upon the Royal Family; and therefore I only juſt mentioned it, as a Book in which this very Calumny has been revived.

Though therefore I am under no particular Obligations to refute your Story, yet ſince ſome People have their Reaſon and Faith under ſo abſolute a Command, and in ſo entire a Subjection to their own Inclinations and Paſſions, or the Intereſts of their Cauſe or Party, as to reject even the cleareſt Evidences, if they have but ſome piece of Secret Hiſtory, an undated, unatteſted, ſtudiouſly concealed Memorandum, or an uncertain Story to oppoſe to them; and with all the confidence to call things of this nature a ſufficient Reply to thoſe Evidences, I ſhall therefore at large, conſider this Story you refer me to, as related by Mr. *Baxter*, and after him by Dr. *Calamy*, and ſhew how little it can ſerve your purpoſe.

Mr. *Baxter* (in his Life, part 3. p. 173. p. 83.) tells us that the Marqueſs of *Antrim* was one of the *Iriſh* Rebels in the begining of that War, (and that at the time) when the horrid Maſſacre, 200000 Proteſtants were Murder'd. His Eſtate being ſequeſtred, he ſought his Reſtitution of it, when King *Charles* the II'd was reſtored. The Duke of *Ormond* and the Council judged againſt him as one of the Rebels. He brought his Cauſe

over

over to the King, and affirmed that what he did was by his Father's Conſent and Authority. The King referr'd it to ſome very worthy Members of his Privy-Council to examine what he had to ſhew. Upon Examination they reported that they found that he had the King's Conſent or Letter of Inſtruction for what he did. Hereupon King *Charles* the IId. wrote to the Duke of *Ormond* and Council, to reſtore his Eſtate, becauſe it appear'd to thoſe appointed to examine it, that what he did was by his Father's Order or Conſent.

This Account of the Story we have there; And in it we muſt diſtinguiſh betwixt Mr. *Baxter*'s Aſſertions, and the Words of (what he calls) the King's Letter to the Duke of *Ormond*. The Letter ſays, that what the Marqueſs of *Antrim* did (by way of Correſpondence, Compliance, *&c.* as I ſhall quote preſently) was by the King's Orders, and it ſays no more than this, that the Marqueſs of *Antrim* was one of the Rebels in the beginning of the War, when 200000 Proteſtants were Murder'd, is purely Mr. *Baxters* own Affirmation, without any the leaſt ground from the Letter, or any juſt Foundation in Hiſtory to ſupport it.

The Letter tells us not the time of the Marqueſs's Correſpondence and Actings, it fixes no Date for the King's Inſtructions, it gives no Hint to gueſs at theſe, but from the End and Deſign of them: Which (it ſays) was the King's Service by reducing the *Iriſh* to their Obedience, and by drawing ſome Forces from them for the Service of *Scotland*. And this ſeems to determine the time of both, to the Year 1643. Whereas the beginning of the War was 1641.

But had we not this Reaſon from the Letter it ſelf to fix the Date of theſe ſo late, yet a Man of a Charitable Temper, of a Chriſtian Spirit, would have judged in the moſt favourable manner, and not have fixed the Date or Time thereof ſooner than he had clear Evidence for doing.

But Mr. *Baxter*'s turn would not be ſerved by ſo Juſt as well as Candid a way of dealing, He is reſolved at any rate to make the Marqueſs one of the firſt that engaged in that Rebellion which begun with the Maſſacre; and to interpret what is ſaid of the King's Inſtructions to him, ſo as to entitle King *Charles* to both.

Is

Is this the practice of a good Man? Or is it any part of that Piety and Integrity, which Dr. *Calamy* tells us, were ſo conſpicuous in Mr. *Baxter*?

But if the Letter does not juſtify Mr. *Baxter*, what does Hiſtory? What Account does that give of the Marqueſs of *Antrim*'s Conduct? This I am now to ſhew you.

But firſt, before I give you the detail of this, it may not be amiſs to obſerve, as a good Preſumption in favour of the Marqueſs, that the Court of Claims in *Ireland*, after the Reſtoration, on hearing his Cauſe, adjudged him innocent; And Sir *Winſton Churchill*, one of the Commiſſioners of it, does, (in his *Divi Brittanici*, p. 347.) clear the King from giving any Orders for, or being any ways concerned in that Rebellion. And yet he could not but know what the Marqueſs of *Antrim*'s Actings, and what the King's Inſtructions were. For as the Marqueſs's Actions were repreſented, ſo the King's Letter likewiſe was laid before them.

It looks well likewiſe in the Marqueſs's behalf, that he is not mentioned in any of the Liſts or Accounts that we have of the Rebels, nor in the Account that we have of thoſe who firſt appeared in the Province of *Ulſter*, (in which Province the County of *Antrim* lies) for the Execution of the Conſpiracy; (ſee *Nalſon*'s Collections, Vol. 2. p. 632.) nor in the Liſt of the Principal Rebels found among the Papers, in the Clerk of the Common's Houſe of Parliaments Office, (*ib.* p. 888;) Nor in the Account we have of them in *Dowdales* Depoſition; (*Borlaſe*'s Hiſtory, p. 39.) Nor in the Proclamation againſt the Rebels, publiſhed by the Lords Juſtices, and Council, *Feb.* 8. 1641, where thoſe then in Rebellion are particularly Named; (*Borlaſe*'s Hiſtory, p. 65, and Appendix from p. 27 to p. 35.) And to be Named in no Catalogue of them, is ſurely a good ſign of his Innocence, and that he had no hand in the Rebellion.

And how little he was concerned either in that, or in the Maſſacre, may appear from Dr. *Maxwell*'s Depoſitions before quoted; In reading which you may ſee ſome of the Rebels, (who were

were desirous at any rate to have him amongst them for a Credit and Support to their Cause) complaining of his (the Marques's) not taking up Arms, you may see others exclaiming against him so long as the *March* following at the end of the Year 1641, for that their Cause suffered by his Non-Concurrence. You may see him condemning the Bloodshed and Robbery which they had been guilty of, and which had even then spoiled their Business, and would be their Ruin. You may see others so imbitter'd against him, as to be for detaining him Prisoner, and crying out against the letting him go, after he had been taken by them. Nay, you may see them carrying their resentments so far against him as to say, he deserved to lose his Head, for saying (as he went thro' *Armagh* at the latter end of *April*, or beginning of *May*, 1642) that he saw nothing among them (the Rebels) but Desolation and execrable Cruelty, for which God's Wrath and the King's just Revenge hung over their Heads, and would speedily overtake them. What then did the Marques's Act in that Rebellion, which the Rebels exclaim'd against him for not joining in? What Hand could the Marques's have in that Massacre, which he so abhor'd, and was so free in expressing his Abhorrence of? Or with what Face, on what pretence can the King be charg'd with being accessary to it thro' a Commission given to the Marques's of *Antrim*, when that very Marques's declares, that his Majesty would speedily Revenge it, and his Justice would fall on the Heads of those that were guilty of it?

Nor are the other Accounts that we have of the Marques's in History inconsistent with these. For when the *Irish*, after they had in *March*, 1641, routed *Archibald Stewart*, animated with the success, invested *Colerain*, we find him using all the good Offices, (which either his Rank and Condition, Consanguinity or Religion could enable him to use with success) to engage them to raise the Siege, and not only doing so, but also sending Provisions, and other relief into the Town. And when the Protestant Army, on, or about *April* the 4th, 1642, came near *Killeullen*, the Marques's of *Antrim*, with the Dutches's of *Buckingham* his Lady, and the Earl of *Castle-Haven*, came in a

Coach to visit the Marquess of *Ormond*, and were kindly received by him, and the whole Army passing by, saluted them.

This is a passage, seemingly of so small a Moment, that it would seem strange to have it expressly recorded in History, did not Sir *Robert Cox* (*Hibernia Anglicana*, *part* 2. *chap.* 1, *p.* 105. and in his *Apparatus*) tell us, his design in mentioning it, (*viz.*) To shew the Reader, that the Earl of *Castle-Haven* was not under any necessity of joining in the *Irish* Rebellion, but might have lived quietly at home, if he had pleas'd. Does not this give us reason to conclude that the latter was the Marquess's practice? For would not he that so carefully marks the Defection of *Castle-Haven*, have observed the same of *Antrim*, had he ever joined the Rebels afterwards, as it is certain he had not done before?

His Sentiments in the beginning of *May*, with regard to the Conduct of the Rebels, I have already shewn. And in *June* 1642, he delivered his strong Castle of *Dunluce* into the Hands of *Monroe*, General of the *Scotch* Forces, who confining his Person, he broke loose from his Restraint, and fled, not to the *Irish* Rebels, but (say the Parliament in their Declaration of *July* the 25th, 1643.) into the Northern Parts of *England*, and the Queen having landed at *Burlington*, in *February* 1642, and come from thence to *York*, he waited on her Majesty there.

About this time, in the beginning of the Year 1643, the Army in *Ireland*, under the Duke of *Ormond*, being reduced to unspeakable extremities of want of all things necessary to the support of their Persons, or Maintenance of the War, and no visible means of preserving the Remnant of the King's good Subjects in that Kingdom from utter Destruction. A Cessation of Arms with the *Irish* Rebels, became absolutely necessary, as you may see expressly asserted in the Lords Justices Letter to the King about the State of *Ireland*, *May* 11, 1643, and in Lord *Clarendon*'s History, Vol. 2. Book 7, from p 319 to p. 337, and in the Opinion of all the Members of the Council of *Ireland*, given under their Hands, the Day that the Cessation was concluded.

This being the Condition of Affairs in that Kingdom, the King by his Letter of *April* the 23d, 1643. impowers the Duke of *Ormond* to Treat with the Rebels, and agree on a Cessation with

with them, giving farther Inſtructions likewiſe about it in his Letter of *May* the 3d.

To promote this work of the Ceſſation, the Marquis of *Antrim* is ſent into *Ireland* by the Queen from *York*, with Letters and Inſtructions for this purpoſe. And his Paſs, to go to *Dublin* and other Parts of the Kingdom, is ſigned by the Earl of *New-Caſtle*, *May* the 4th, 1643, which Paſs, with the Letters aforeſaid, were found in the Marqueſs's Pocket, when he was taken by *Monroe* (as the Parliament ſay in the Declaration aforementioned) in the County of *Down*, or as *Monroe*'s Letter from *Carrickfergus*, (in the Caſtle whereof the Marqueſs was kept Priſoner) dated *May* 23, 1643. tells us more particularly, in a Bark coming from the Iſle of *Man*, which Bark he had the good fortune to hawl as he lay before the Caſtle of *New-Caſtle*.

And that this was the Marqueſs's deſign, and the purpoſe of thoſe Inſtructions which he had from the Queen, (the Parliament tells us) appears not only from the Confeſſion of the Marqueſs himſelf, but from that likewiſe of his Servant, *Maſter Stewart* (who was taken with him) when they were both under Examination before General *Monroe* and the Council of War, *June* 12, 1643.

Sometime after this he got his Liberty, and coming into *England*, ſettled at *Oxford*. The Ceſſation was perfected and Signed *September* the 15th, 1643; and at the latter end of this Year, the Marqueſs of *Montroſs* coming to *Oxford*, and engaging to raiſe ſuch a Party in *Scotland* for the King, as ſhould oblige the *Scotch* Army to return out of *England*, if he had but ſome Troops to begin with, and to ſerve for a Protection to the Royaliſts that ſhould join him. The Marqueſs of *Antrim* is ſent to *Ireland* with *Daniel Oneal*, (a wiſe and faithful Servant of the King's, and a Proteſtant) with Inſtructions to draw a Body of Men out of that Kingdom, to ſerve as a foundation for *Montroſs*'s raiſing Forces in *Scotland*. This Body was to be ſent in *April*, 1644. But (as in the Execution of

Cox, Hiber. Ang. *part* 2. *Chap.* 1, *p.* 133. * Borlace, *p.* 118.

Designs, unforeseen difficulties often arise to retard it) did not Land in the High Lands of *Scotland*, till about the end of *July* following. These Forces were in Number about 1500 (say *Clarendon* and other Historians) and were Commanded by *Alexander Mac Donnel*, Brother to the Marquess, and behaved themselves with the utmost bravery in all the daring Actions and amazing Victories, that *Montross* won against the Rebels in that Kingdom.

Whitlock (in his Memoirs, p. 93) says, these Forces were 2500, and makes the Marquess to be with them in Person, (p. 99,) and all along where-ever he mentions the Marquess, he still supposes him to be in *Scotland*, (see p. 225, 231, 232) even till the end of the Year 1646. But this Account of his seems not to be exact, since those who have given us the most distinct Relations of *Montross*'s Actions in *Scotland*, take not the least notice of the Marquess of *Antrim*'s being there. And yet all the Historians that we have to give us an Account of the Affairs of *Ireland*, are as entirely silent as to his being in that Kingdom. Nor have we any mention of him, till after the conclusion of the Peace, *March* the 28th, 1646. And therefore it would be very hard Treatment to charge him with any act of Rebellion in that time, since there is not the least ground for it, nor indeed can be, when we consider that the Cessation lasted all this while, and was continued from time to time, from *September* 15, 1643, till it ended in that Peace, which was concluded on *March* the 28th, and finally perfected, *July* the 30th, 1646.

And now as Sir *Robert Cox* (in his *Apparatus*) observes, Affairs took a new turn, and what passes after this, concerns not the Argument, and there is no pretence of the Marquess's acting by any Orders from the King.

However, to lay before you what History records of him, I find him sent into *France* by the General Assembly of *Kilkenny*, to the Queen and Prince, in *January* 1647, to desire a Lord Lieutenant might be sent over to them. They that went with the Marquess,

† Borlase, *p.* 199. Hib. Ang. Cha. I. *p.* 202.

queſs, propoſed and obtained of the Queen, that the Duke of *Ormond* might be the Man ſent over; tho' in this point, the Marqueſs diſſented from and oppoſed them, there having been long an open and declared hatred between him and the Duke.

The Marqueſs returns from *France* in *September*, and on the 29th of the ſame Month, 1648, the Duke of *Ormond* Lands at *Cork*, and in *November* goes to *Kilkenny* to Treat with the Supream Council about a Peace, which is concluded and ſigned *January* 17, 1648, the *Nuncio* daclares againſt it, but is forced to fly the Kingdom, *February* 23d. However *Owen Oneal* and the Marqueſs of *Antrim* adhere to him, and ſtand it out againſt the Peace which was concluded but 13 Days before King *Charles* was Murder'd in *England*, whoſe Orders therefore ſurely cannot be pretended for this great Conduct of the Marqueſs.

His whole Conduct from this time is juſtly blameable, but it is as clear, that it cannot be imputed to King *Charles*, and that it was impoſſible for that Prince to give his Conſent and Inſtructions for it. For whether his Picque againſt the Duke of *Ormond*, or a deſire to ſave his Eſtate by Compliance with the *Regicides*, and meriting their favour, who had then all the Power of *England* in their Hands, and would ſoon, in all human appearance, reduce *Ireland*; Whether either of theſe were the motives of his Actions, 'tis certain, he not only ſtood out againſt the Peace with *Owen Oneal* (who was at laſt by *Daniel Oneal*'s Intereſt and Negotiation brought over to join the Duke of *Ormond*, *October* 2, 1649) but by means of his Prieſt *Kelly*, carry'd on an Intriegue with *Cromwell* from the time of his Landing, which was *Auguſt* 15, 1649, and from the time of the taking of *Roſs*, which was in the beginning of *October*, the Correſpondence became the more intimate and effectual, ſo that as Sir *Robert Cox* (*Hibernia Anglicana, part* 2. *chap.* 2. *p.* 55) ſays on *May* the 9th, 1650, his officious deſires to ſerve that Party, prevail'd with him to importune a Conference with Commiſſary General *Reynolds* and the Biſhop of *Clogher*, and afterwards with that Biſhop, and Collonel *Owen*. In which, tho' the deſign was to aſperſe the Memory of King *Charles* the Iſt, and to juſtifie and encourage his Enemies; and ſo *Ireton* underſtood it, as is manifeſt

manifeſt from the favour and kindneſs he thereupon ſhewed to that Lord, yet when diſcourſing about a Commiſſion being granted by the late King to the *Iriſh*, for their riſing and acting as they had done in *Ireland*, on *October* 23, 1641, and after, the Marqueſs of *Antrim* ſaid, that he knew nothing of any ſuch Commiſſion.

Not long after this Conference, *Antrim* had a Paſs for going into *England*, and an Order from *Ireton* to go among his Tenants, and levy what Money he could for his Journey. By virtue whereof he raiſed 1000 *l.* and came to *Cheſter*, *December* 3, 1650, carrying with him likewiſe a Letter from *Ireton* to the Council of State, importing, that he the Marqueſs of *Antrim* had done the Parliament Army ſingular Service ſince the firſt Day they came before *Roſs*, and ſo recommended him to their favour, to compound for his Eſtate (for which he had 9 Months time given him,) for 2 of which he was to be protected from all Suits, and the rather for that it did not appear, that he had an hand in the beginning of the Rebellion.

Having thus traced the Conduct of the Marqueſs of *Antrim*, thro' the whole Courſe of thoſe Rebellious Times, it will help us to explain the ſeveral particulars contained in that Letter, which Mr. *Baxter* makes the great ground of the Charge againſt King *Charles* the Iſt, and which he ſays King *Charles* the IId, wrote to the Duke of *Ormond* and Council.

This Letter was wrote by King *Charles* the IId's Order, *July* the 10th, is ſigned *Henry Bennet*, and paſſed the Signet Office, *July* 13. 1663. and is to be found at length in *Ludlow's* Memoirs, *vol.* 3. from *p.* 353. to *p.* 357.

In it we may obſerve King *Charles* the IId's Averſeneſs, to interpoſe in behalf of any, that by their Miſcarriages in the late Rebellion in *Ireland*, had made themſelves unworthy of his Grace and Protection; an Averſeneſs that was notorious unto all Men, and particularly ſhewn in the Caſe of the Marqueſs of *Antrim*. We may obſerve his Jealouſy in this Point ſo great, as only on a general Information of the Misbehaviour of the Marqueſs towards himſelf and his Father of bleſſed Memory, (the proof of which was deferr'd) to deny him Admiſſion into his Preſence,

Preſence, and to Impriſon him in the Tower of *London*, to continue him there under a ſtrict Reſtraint for ſeveral Months, to ſend him afterwards to *Ireland* without interpoſing the leaſt in his Behalf, and to leave him there to undergo ſuch a Tryal and Puniſhment, as ſhould by the Juſtice of the Kingdom be found due to his Crime.

We may likewiſe, whilſt the King was expecting, that purſuant to the Information he had received, ſome heinous Matter would be objected and proved againſt him, ſee the Marqueſs after many Months attendance there, and 'tis to be preſumed, after ſuch Examinations as were requiſite, diſmiſs'd without any Cenſure, without any tranſmiſſion of Charge againſt him, and with a Licence to tranſport himſelf into *England*. Theſe are are all good Signs of the Marqueſs's Innocence, and make for him.

Nor does what follows in the Letter, give any juſt grounds for Mr. *Baxter*'s uncharitable Inferences from it. It takes Notice of the Marqueſs's meriting by his former Actions the favour and protection of the King, and of the many Services he had done, and the Sufferings he had undergone for his Affection and Fidelity to the King's Royal Father and himſelf. Which Services were (as appears from Hiſtory, from the very Letter before us, and from the Act which reſtored the Marqueſs to his Eſtate) his reducing the *Iriſh* to Obedience, drawing Forces from them to ſend to *Montroſs* in *Scotland*, and not only aſſiſting King *Charles* the IId. with Arms and Ammunition, whilſt he was in the Weſt, but alſo furniſhing him with Ships to make his Eſcape into Forreign Parts, when his Armies were defeated in the Weſt.

In a Senſe of theſe Services, the King recommended to the Lord Lieutenant, to move the Council of *Ireland* for preparing a Bill to be tranſmited over, for the re-inveſting the Marqueſs into the Poſſeſſion of his Eſtate in that Kingdom.

The Lord Lieutenant and Council indeed (as appears from the Letter) were of Opinion, that ſuch a Bill ought not to be tranſmited. The Reaſons of which Opinion, they give in their

Letter

Letter of *March* 18. which they ſent over to the King, with a Petition from the Old Soldiers and Adventurers.

The equity of the Petition conſiſted only in this, that they had been peaceably poſſeſſed of the Marqueſs of *Antrim*'s Eſtate for 7 or 8 Years, were very deſirous to keep it longer, and ſhould ſuffer if it was taken from them. And the Reaſons of the Council were only, that they were inform'd, that he (the Marqueſs) had put in his Claim before the Commiſſioners appointed for executing the Act of Settlement, and that if he was by them adjudged Innocent, there was no need of the Bill, but if Nocent, it was not conſiſtent with their Duty to tranſmit ſuch a Bill, as if paſs'd into a Law, would be a prejudice to ſo many Soldiers and Adventurers.

Theſe Reaſons (you ſee) charge nothing againſt the Marqueſs, and the Council only deſire, that his Cauſe may be determined by the Commiſſioners for executing the Act of Settlement.

The King however cauſes all the Letters and Petitions ſent to him to be examined by ſeveral Lords of the Privy Council, who, after a full Hearing of what could be alledged on both ſides, make this Report, that they have ſeen ſeveral Letters, all of the Hand-writing of King *Charles* the Iſt. to the ſaid Marqueſs, and ſeveral Inſtructions concerning his treating and joining with the *Iriſh* in order to the King's Service, by reducing them to their Obedience, and by drawing Forces from them for the Service of *Scotland*. That (beſides the Letters and Orders under his Majeſty's Hand) they have receiv'd ſufficient Evidence and Teſtimony, of ſeveral private Meſſages and Directions ſent from King *Charles* the Iſt, and from his Queen, with the Privity and Direction of the King her Husband, by which they are perſwaded, that whatever Intelligence, Correſpondence, or Actings the ſaid Marqueſs had with the Confederate *Iriſh* Catholicks, was directed or allowed by the ſaid Letters, Inſtructions and Directions, and that it manifeſtly appears to them, that King *Charles* the Iſt was well pleaſed with what the Marqueſs did, after he had done it and approved the ſame.

This

This is the Paſſage of the Letter and the Report of the Members of the Council which Mr. *Baxter* founds his Charge againſt King *Charles* the Iſt upon, and with Regard to which Report the King declares at the End of the Letter, that he cannot but in Juſtice, and after a ſtrict Diſquiſition into the Actions of the Marqueſs, declare, that he finds him Innocent from any Malice or Rebellious Purpoſe againſt the Crown; and that what he did by way of Correſpondence or Compliance with the *Iriſh* Rebels was in order to the Service of his Royal Father, and warranted by his Inſtructions and the Truſt repoſed in him; and that the Benefit thereof accrewed to the Service of the Crown, and not to the particular Benefit and Advantage of the Marqueſs. And the whole plainly relates to the Correſpondence and Actings, which the Marqueſs had with the Rebels, in order to get Forces for *Montroſs*'s Aſſiſtance, or to make a Peace, or at leaſt a Ceſſation with them, which was then abſolutely neceſſary for the Preſervation of the King's Army in *Ireland*, and the ſecurity of his good Subjects there, as I have obſerved before, and may be ſeen likewiſe in the King's Motives to a Ceſſation publiſhed *October* 19. 1643.

And the Letter ſo expreſly tells us, this to be the end of all the King's Inſtructions, and the Marqueſs's Correſpondence, that Mr. *Baxter*, did he not read this Letter with the blindeſt prejudice, or were he not reſolved to prevent its true meaning, muſt ſee it.

But ſo fair, ſo juſt a Conſtruction would not ſerve his Purpoſe. No Body could blame the King for making a Ceſſation ſo neceſſary for him in the Circumſtances his Affairs were then in: Or for endeavouring to rid his Hands of one Enemy in *Ireland*, ſo that he might draw his Forces thence to aſſiſt him againſt other more powerful and dangerous, and not leſs implacable Enemies in *England*. (as he did, ſee *Borlace* Hiſtory *p.* 139) and to procure others to be ſent to *Scotland*.

And if he gave any Body Orders or Inſtructions for Treating with them for this end, every one muſt ſee that this could be no more called giving a Commiſſion to the *Iriſh* Rebels than his empowering others to Treat with the *Engliſh* Rebels at *Ux-*

bridge, could be called a giving them a Commiſſion to fight againſt him, or an authoriſing their Rebellion. Nor could the Marqueſs in Juſtice be ſtiled a Rebel, for treating and correſponding with the *Iriſh* in order to a Peace, any more than thoſe whom the King empower'd in *England* for the like purpoſe were: And therefore Mr. *Baxter*, to blacken the King, and render him as odious as poſſible, makes the Marqueſs to be concerned in the beginning of the Rebellion at the time of the Maſſacre, and inſinuates, that the King's Inſtructions related to his Actings then, contrary to the Words and Senſe of the Letter, contrary alſo to the Accounts which the Hiſtories of thoſe Times give us of the Marqueſs's Conduct, which (as I have traced it) appears to be ſuch as ſhews, that the Inſtructions from the Queen (mention'd in the Letter of *July* 10, 1663) were given to the Marqueſs at the beginning of the Year 1643, as thoſe from the King were at the end of the ſame Year.

And that theſe were thoſe very Inſtructions and no other, appears undeniably (to the full ſatisfaction of all that reverence the Royal Martyr's Memory, and the Confuſion of thoſe who impiouſly load it with ſuch heavy Calumnies) from King *Charles* II's own Words, deliver'd on this very Subject of the Letter, in the moſt authentick manner, in an Act of Parliament (*Anno* 17 & 18 *Car.* 2.) in the 2*d* Act about the *Iriſh* forfeited Eſtates, and which I think, is the ſame with that called the Act of Explanation paſſed *Dec.* 15. 1665. in which he declares, that the Teſtimony of the Marqueſs of *Antrim*'s Innocence, which he had given in that Letter of *July* 16. 1663, and which at the end of that Letter, the Duke of *Ormond* and Council are required to tranſmit to the Commiſſioners for executing the Act of Settlement, for them to regulate their Proceedings by, was only to declare, that the Marqueſs of *Antrim* was employed in *Ireland*, to procure what Forces he could from thence, to be tranſported into *Scotland* for his late Majeſty's Service, under the late Marqueſs of *Montroſs*, to the end, that the Converſation of the ſaid Marqueſs of *Antrim* in the Rebels Quarters, which was neceſſary for that Service, might not, according to the Letter of the former Act, render him Criminal: Theſe are the Words of that Act of

Parliament

Parliament, and is it poſſible for any thing more clearly to ſhew what the King's Inſtructions, and what the Marqueſs of *Antrim*'s Correſpondence and Actings purſuant thereto were? Do they not appear to be perfectly Innocent? And what then has Mr. *Baxter* to Anſwer for, for repreſenting them otherwiſe?

I ſhall only obſerve one thing farther, (*viz.*) that by the firſt Act of Settlement, thoſe that join'd with the Nuncio and oppoſed the Peace of 1646, or that of 1648, forfeited their Eſtates. And as the Marqueſs by his Conduct in that Point (which I have repreſented before) had, according to the Letter of that Act, forfeited his: The Council of *Ireland* (who on all occaſions ſeem to favour the Cauſe of the Adventurers) in their Letter of *July* 31, 1663, deſirous to keep the Marqueſs from his Eſtate, and having nothing elſe to charge him with, inſiſt on that Clauſe in the Act, and the Marqueſs's Conduct in that particular, and repreſent to the King, that if the Marqueſs was reſtored to his Eſtate and adjudged Innocent, it would infringe the Act of the Settlement, which was the very foundation of the Kingdom's Peace and Quiet. The King therefore ſenſible of the Inconveniencies of breaking through that Act, and of a Precedent of that kind in the Court of Claims (that Court having adjudged the Marqueſs Innocent, though Condemn'd by the Letter of the Act) thought fit by the Act of Explanation to provide for the Security of the Adventurers in general, and as the Marqueſs's particular Caſe was entitled to his Compaſſion and Favour, to provide likewiſe for his Relief, by repealing at once the Judgment of the Court of Claims in his favour, and reſtoring him to his Eſtate by that Act.

And as for that other Story in Mr. *Baxter*, about the Lord *Mazarine*'s and others, proſecuting the Cauſe ſo far, as that the Marqueſs of *Antrim* was forced to produce in the Parliament of *England*, in the Houſe of Commons, a Letter of King *Charles* I. by which he gave him Order for his taking up Arms; if this Letter of the King's was one of thoſe produced before the Lords Referees of the Council, it has been already conſidered and cleared, and as it relates only to the Marqueſs's drawing Forces out of *Ireland* for the Service of *Scotland*; the King

can be no more blameable for giving the Marqueſs of *Antrim* ſuch Order, than for givin gone to the Marqueſs of *Montroſs* for the like purpoſe and for the ſame Service. But then this does not ſerve the purpoſe of thoſe who quote this Letter, and does not in the leaſt ſupport the Charge they lay againſt the King.

And yet, if it is pretended, that it is none of thoſe which were laid before the Lords of the Council, it will be hard to account how the Marqueſs came not to produce it before them for his fuller Vindication: A Man, all whoſe Fortune depends on his being able to clear or juſtifie his Conduct, is very rarely ſhy of producing what is neceſſary for that end; and this and other Circumſtances about the Letter, give us juſt grounds to ſuſpect the Story, and (till we ſee better Reaſon to credit it) to look upon it as one of thoſe Lies, which that Faction (whoſe Rebellion ſubverted our Conſtitution, and to whoſe Malice the King himſelf fell a Sacrifice) have never ſcrupled to raiſe, and to aſſert with Confidence, whenever they thereby could ſerve the Intereſts of their Cauſe, a Cauſe indeed that needed them and could not be ſupported otherwiſe.

That the Lord *Mazarine* ſhould Petition againſt the Marqueſs, is no wonder; he had part of his Eſtate, and was deſirous to keep it. And though he and Sir *John Clotworthy* (whoſe Daughter and Heireſs he had Married) had been engaged with the Faction in thoſe Times, and he then actually enjoyed the Plunder of one of the King's Palaces, yet conſidering the uſual Modeſty of the Party, which was ſo egregious, as hardly ever to ſuffer them to beg Pardon of the King for their Rebellion, or ſhew a ſenſe of Shame for what they had acted againſt him; we have no reaſon to be ſurpriz'd at that Lords Petitioning, that he might be ſtill allowed to retain what of the Marqueſs of *Antrim*'s Eſtate he was poſſeſſed of.

But that he ſhould Petition the Parliament of *England*, and bring the Cauſe before the Houſe of Commons here, is a point that may well be queſtion'd. I cannot find it in any Account but what Mr. *Baxter* refers us to, ſo that (for ought appears) it ſtands upon the ſingle Authority of the Writer of the Pamphlet called *Murder will out*; an Authority too wretched and incon-

inconſiderable to give Weight and Credit to the vrieſt Trifle in this Diſpute.

The Act of Explanation which reſtored the Marqueſs to his Eſtate, and which paſſed *Dec.* 15, 1665, mentions a ſolemn Hearing before his Majeſty at the Council Board in *England*, and upon a Petition exhibited by ſeveral Adventurers and Soldiers (of which in all probability the Lord *Mazarine* was one) againſt the Marqueſs, and the Judgment and Decree of the Court of Claims in his favour, but gives not the leaſt hint of any Petition preſented in the Parliament of *England*, which ſurely it would have done, had any been then preſented; and it would be too late to preſent any afterwards, when the King had by Act of Parliament reſtored the Marqueſs to his Eſtate, and thereby put an end to all Diſputes about it.

And indeed the Council was the proper Court for the Petitioners to apply to, whereas the *Engliſh* Parliament meddled not in the Settlement of *Ireland*. Yet the Story makes them apply to a Court before whom the Cognizance of their Cauſe did not properly lie, and ſays, that their Petition was preſented, but without telling us when. 'Tis dangerous to fix a time for ſome Facts, it might diſcover their falſhood, and therefore it is waved in this Caſe; and thoſe who are willing to beleive the Charge againſt King *Charles*, are left to imagine, this Petition preſented ſome time or other, they know not when, to beleive a matter of Fact without any juſt proof or credible teſtimonial of it.

And as to the Letter ſaid to be produc'd on occaſion of this Petition, we are told, that the Original of it was once (as Dr. *Calamy* was informed) in the Paper Office, but now it is we know not where. The time of its being wrote we are not made acquainted with, and muſt be therefore at a loſs about the Date of it, as well as about that part of the Marqueſs's Conduct, which he produced it to juſtifie. This looks very ſuſpicious indeed, but what more directly proves the falſhood of the Letter, or the Repreſentation made of it is, That it is quoted for juſtifying a Man for doing what he never did, (as you ſee by the Marqueſs's Conduct before related) and for

giving

giving the Marqueſs a Commiſſion to take up Arms in the *Iriſh* Rebellion, which the Marqueſs himſelf knew nothing of, and which he was ſo far from pretending to or counterfeiting, that (when he was moſt deſirous to curry favour with the *Engliſh* Rebels, at whoſe Mercy he lay, and to whom he could not poſſibly recommend himſelf, more than by accuſing the King in this point) he utterly diſavows all knowledge of any Commiſſion whatever given to the *Iriſh* for taking Arms; as he does expreſsly in his Conference before quoted, which he confirmed the truth of and atteſted under his Hand, *Aug.* 22, 1650.

And is not this a fine Story to ground one of the blackeſt Charges in Nature againſt King *Charles* upon! A Story that is attended with ſuch ſuſpicions and inconſiſtencies, and is palmed upon us without a Witneſs to atteſt it, (for an unknown one is none at all) and ſtands only on the no Credit of the uncertain Author of a ſcandalous Pamphlet, * who might, for ought Dr. *Calamy* knows) be the Author alſo of the Letter he makes the Marqueſs of *Antrim* to produce, and be guilty of an horrid Impoſition on the World, by repreſenting it otherwiſe, and putting it to a different purpoſe than it really ſerved to, and who was certainly of a Party of Men of the ſame Principles with thoſe, who loaded King *Charles*, when alive, with ſo many and horrid Lyes, and who would not therefore much ſcruple aſperſing his Memory when Dead, if the doing ſo would advance the Intereſts of their Cauſe: A Cauſe which they promoted by the moſt abominable Forgeries that ever Men were guilty of, and by the very common but villanous practice of counterfeiting Authors, forging Papers, Letters and Petitions, and then impoſing them upon the World for genuine, of which practice of theirs you may ſee ſeveral Inſtances in Mr. *Wagſtaff's* excellent Vindication of King *Charles* the Martyr's Title to the Εικὼν Βασιλικὴ, Printed 1711, from *p.* 116. to *p.* 132. and *p.* 12, 13, and in the Earl of *Clarendon's* Hiſtory.

And

* *Abridgment of* Baxter's *Life*, p. 44.

And now, Sir, to consider briefly Mr. *Baxter*'s Conduct and manner of expressing his Sentiments in the Case before us. We may observe with what a Sneer, he mentions (what he calls) the egregious Loyalty and Veneration of Majesty in the House of Commons, which was such, that the Letter produced before them, put them not at all one step out of the way which they had gone in.

It seems, it did not alter their Sentiments of the King, they still thought (because they knew) him to be Innocent of this Charge: For whatever Mr. *Baxter* may think of the Sense and Conduct of the Royalists in this point, their Judgment and Testimony are not to be laughed at, but will with unprejudiced Men have their weight, and be allowed as no inconsiderable Vindication of him.

For who could know the King's Innocence or Guilt so well as they? They were the Men that were about him constantly; they knew his Councils, his Secrets, his Actings and Proceedings; they were privy to all his Affairs, were consulted in all the Measures that he took, were necessary to the carrying on of any of his Designs, and best knew the real Sense of his Heart; and if they who were best able to judge of and had the greatest of knowing his Mind and Actions; if they cleared the King from this Charge, is it for those who had no such opportunities, no such means of knowing them, to dare to accuse him of it?

And as for those without Doors, we know that there is nothing so absurd, so unreasonable and malicious, but some of them will say it; and we know as well a Writer's meaning that quotes their seditious Speeches; they are a very convenient sort of Creatures for an Author's purpose; for when he has a mind to say things he dare not own, 'tis but putting it into their Mouths, and he gratifies his Malice without the hazard of his Credit, whilst he would be thought to relate other People's Sentiments and not his own; but the Artifice is grown stale and common, every one sees through it, and whosoever the Words are, we know whose Sense they speak.

Now what theſe are brought in for, is to inſinuate, That the King was not againſt the *Iriſh* Rebellion: But how can this be imagined? Was not that Rebellion the ruin of his Affairs? Was it not inconſiſtent with every part of his Character? Did he not on all occaſions, and with the moſt pathetical and vehement Expreſſions declare, and in all his Conduct ſhew his abhorrence of it? And can any honeſt or good Man ſuſpect him of Inſincerity? No, Men generally judge of others by themſelves, and it is not ſo very ſtrange, that a Race of Men all whoſe Profeſſions, whoſe moſt ſolemn Appeals to God for the ſincerity of their Promiſes to make him a glorious King, were falſe and hypocritical, or thoſe who inherit their Principles, are engaged in the ſame Cauſe, and tread in the ſame Steps, ſhould ſuſpect his to be ſo likewiſe: But that they ſhould this, without Evidence to ſupport their ſuſpicions, in oppoſition to his neareſt Intereſts, againſt the whole tenour of his Actions, and all the Reaſon of Things. This muſt raiſe, if not the wonder, at leaſt the indignation of every fair and impartial Perſon.

With what pretence to Reaſon can Mr. *Baxter* make any to ſuggeſt, that the Rebels did not belie the King, when they ſaid, that they had his Warrant or Commiſſion? Were not all the Intereſt of the *Iriſh*, and all the Malice and Power of the *Engliſh* Rebels, too weak to ſhew that any Commiſſion was given them? Did not Sir *Phelim Oneal*, the Head of that Rebellion, under the greateſt Tryals and with his dying Words, clear him from this Charge? Did not the Rebels in general own, that their pretence to it was a Lie? Did they not in a Body wave all pretenſions to a Commiſſion, and acknowledge the King's abhorrence of their Rebellion? Does not the Marqueſs of *Antrim* alſo expreſly clear him, and declare, that he knew not of any Commiſſion ever given to the *Iriſh*? Was ever Innocence better proved? Can any thing be added to ſet it in a better Light, or to expoſe more ſhamefully the Malice of thoſe who revive the Calumny?

Nor

Nor is the next Inſinuation leſs malicious and unjuſt, (*viz.*) as if the King with a treacherous Mind, had offered to go himſelf with an Army into *Ireland* to fight againſt them.

His Virtues, and particularly his Integrity, were too bright and manifeſt to all the World, to be tarniſhed with the baſe Suſpicions of his Enemies: Treachery never made any part of his Character, never appeared in any one Action of his, but was notoriouſly the main Ingredient in the Compoſition of his Enemies, and was uſed by them in the whole courſe of their Conduct, ſo that for them to accuſe him of Treachery was the higheſt Impudence, as their Accuſation was the baſeſt Slander.

And as for thoſe Wiſhes, which Mr. *Baxter* puts upon thoſe that were ſtill Loyal to the King, *viz.* That King *Charles* II. had rather declared (*viz.* in the Letter of *July* the 10*th*) That his Father did only give the Marqueſs of *Antrim* Commiſſion to raiſe an Army, as to have helped him againſt the *Scots*. What need of this Wiſh, when King *Charles* II. has plainly done it, as I have ſhewn in the Examination of that Letter? Or of the other Wiſh, that his (the Marqueſs's) turning againſt the *Engliſh* Proteſtants in *Ireland*, and the Murdering ſo many hundred thouſands, had been declared to have been againſt his (King *Charles*'s) Will? And what need likewiſe of that ſolemn Addition, containing in it a vile Inſinuation and Charge, which we have in theſe Words? But *quod ſcriptum erat, ſcriptum erat.*

For a Man to charge the Marqueſs of *Antrim* with being concerned in the beginning of the Rebellion, and with having an hand in the Murder of ſo many hundred thouſand Proteſtants, and this without a ſingle Fact in Hiſtory to ſupport the Charge againſt the Confeſſions and Exclamations of the Rebels, againſt the expreſs Teſtimony of *Ireton* in his behalf, is certainly a Wickedneſs of very heinous Nature.

To do this, and to wreſt the Words of a Letter, in order to ſtain the Honour of one of the beſt Princes that ever filled a Throne, and to impute an Impiety of ſuch a Nature to a Prince of admirable Virtues, a Prince who had been dead for

many Years, who as he had led a Life full of Sorrows and embitter'd with the heavieſt Calamities, died alſo in ſuch Circumſtances as muſt move the Compaſſion of all that have any Humanity in them, and might (one would think) melt the Heart even of his moſt cruel Enemies, he being Murder'd before his own Palace, in all the Pomp of a Tryumph, by the moſt barbarous Rebels under the Sun, and to treat him in this manner, to purſue him even beyond Death, and not let his Aſhes to reſt in Peace, but to call him from the Grave, to Arraign him afreſh, and Murder him in his Memory, has in it all the Circumſtances of Baſeneſs.

To do this, and to lay upon him a Charge, in its Nature inhumane, in its Circumſtances incredible, without all intrinſick or outward Evidence, inconſiſtent with the King's Character, contrary to his publick Acts, to his conſtant Profeſſions, to his repeated and vehement Declarations of abhorrence, his ſolemn Appeals to God, his whole Conduct and Actions, his Offers, his Religion and his very Intereſt, againſt the Teſtimony of all that were about his Perſon, and of all the Hiſtorians who have wrote of thoſe Times, of Friends and Enemies, of Rebels as well as Subjects, *i. e.* againſt all the Evidence that the Nature of the Thing will admit of, and in ſpite of 10000 Abſurdities and Contradictions, is a practice ſo full of horror, an iniquity of ſuch a ſize, as I want Words to expreſs its juſt demerit. And yet this is what Mr. *Baxter* has done, with what Conſcience let all indifferent People judge, with what End is plain from his own Words, after his falſe Accuſation of the Marqueſs of *Antrim* and vile perverting of King *Charles* II's Words and Meaning in his Letter. Upon this (ſays Mr. *Baxter*) the Parliaments old Adherents grew more Confident than ever (they were always Confident, and among theſe Mr. *Baxter*, but now more than ever) of the Righteouſneſs of their Wars, and the very Deſtroyers of the King, whom the firſt Parliamentarians called *Rebels*, did preſume alſo to juſtifie their Cauſe, and ſaid, that the Law of Nature did warrant them.

Here

Here we ſee the End of horrid Slander on the King, and the Uſe to be made of it, (*viz.*) to leſſen the horror of his Martyrdom, to ſhew the Righteouſneſs of the moſt unnatural and inexcuſable Rebellion that was ever raiſed, and to juſtifie even the Cauſe of the Regicides.

Such Cauſes indeed are not to be carried on but by ſuch vile Methods, by a ſucceſſion of ſuch Calumnies, as have been thrown on the bleſſed Martyr: But to joyn in theſe Methods, and to propagate theſe Calumnies, whatever Policy there be in it, has certainly in it abundance of Impiety.

But as bad as it is, it is one degree leſs execrable than the calling upon Providence to juſtifie it, and to Father the horridly unjuſt and ſcandalous Aſperſion thrown on the King. And yet Dr. *Calamy* (in his Abridgment of Mr. *Baxter*'s Life, *p.* 43. *Edit.* 1713.) imputes the Diſcovery of it to Providence, and ſays, That, as Providence order'd it, a certain memorable Particularity (*viz.*) The Story of the Marqueſs of *Antrim*, (which I have refuted) help'd to ſet this matter in a juſt light, *i. e.* (as he thinks) to ſhew that King *Charles* was guilty of the Charge. The falſhood of this I have ſhewn already, and ſhall only obſerve farther, that to make Providence order the publiſhing of a Story, whoſe weight is owing only to downright Falſhoods, or unfair Repreſentations of the Senſe of Words, for ſo baſe an End, is treading in the Steps of the Rebels of 1648; the Regicides of thoſe days, we know, called upon God to warrant the Murdering of their King in his Perſon, as Dr. *Calamy* does for the Murdering of him in his Memory.

This is a Point, in which Dr. *Calamy* can't call upon Mr. *Baxter* to Patronize him in, as he does for quoting the Story of the Marqueſs of *Antrim* from him. But is there not the ſame Reaſon and Conſcience to keep a Man from ſpreading as from raiſing a Lye? Is it not a very poor Excuſe for the Injury done to the Royal Martyr's Honour, by publiſhing a notorious Calumny of him, for a Man to ſay he tranſcribes it from another, and therefore is not to Anſwer for it? Dr. *Calamy* ſhould know better what a Man owes to Truth and Juſtice

ſtice, and that he who ſpreads a Lye, does by that Act adopt it for his own, becomes a Party to it, and makes it his own Act and Deed, and muſt anſwer for his Publiſhing, as well as the Author for his Inventing it.

And as for your own Conduct in this Diſpute: That a Man at this time ſhould dare to load the Memory of the Royal Martyr with ſo horrid a Slander: That this ſhould be done by you, who have generally paſſed for a fairer and more moderate Man than moſt of your Sect, is what I am ſorry, as others are ſurprized to find, and may teach us how to judge of others of the ſame Party of Men, who have more Warmth in their Nature, and leſs Caution in their Conduct: That you ſhould do this in the publick manner that you did, ſhould ſpread your firſt Letter with ſo much Diligence, ſo much Oſtentation, as to place it in the Shops of this Town to be diſtributed about (of which I was aſſured by a Perſon to whom three Copies of it were actually offer'd on *Feb.* 4. in the Afternoon, before I had ſent, or indeed finiſhed my firſt Letter to you, and which made me haſten the ſending that Letter) does not look as if you deſired private Information; but as you had made your Challenge publick, ſo you expected a publick Diſpute. That you ſhould (after I had laid before you the Reaſons and Teſtimonies of K. *Charles*'s Innocence, contained in my Letter of *Feb.* 3. and repreſented the defectiveneſs of the Charge againſt him in point of Proof, and the neceſſity of its being proved before it could be needful to clear him) ſtill perſiſt in your Demand of having it more particularly diſproved, ſend me yours of *Feb.* 4, and with a ſurpriſing Modeſty tell me, you think it a ſufficient Reply to what I urged in mine for the King's Vindication, is, what will make me have a modeſt Opinion indeed of the Effect, which the Proofs that I have now brought of the King's Innocence may have on you towards your Conviction.

I have however anſwered your Challenge, and cleared the Buſineſs of the Marqueſs of *Antrim*, I have (what has been always been thought too unreaſonable to be demanded) even proved a Negative, and ſhewn, that he was not concerned (as Mr. *Baxter* charges him) in the beginning of the Rebellion or Maſſacre,

facre, and that there is not the leaſt Ground for the falſe and malicious Interpretation made of King *Charles* the IId's ſenſe in the Letter of *July* 10, 1663, I have therefore given you the Satisfaction you deſired, and all the evidence that can be expected about a matter of Fact, and may therefore juſtly be allowed now to require you to make an Ackrowledgment of the Royal Martyr's Innocence as Publick as your Charge againſt him was. This is the only Satisfaction that you can make for the Injury you have done his Memory, and Juſtice exacts it as far at your Hands, and if you decline doing it, it will give the World no advantageous Opinion, either of your Charity in advancing ſo abominable a Charge againſt King *Charles*, or of your Honeſty not retracting it.

I ſhall take notice but of one thing more, and that is the Inſults and Triumphs of many on the delay of this Anſwer. Well wiſhers to a good Cauſe, be it never ſo bad an one, can hardly conceal their Transports at every imaginary advantage that they gain; and what little Ground there was for their Triumphs and Confidences, you may by this time be ſenſible of, and it can hardly be needful for me to aſſure you that this delay was occaſioned, not ſo much by the difficulty of clearing the point, which is the chief Subject of this, as by the vaſt hurry of the Buſineſs (of which they could not be Ignorant) incumbent on me in this place, which has been ſo great that from the Receipt of yours till the Date above, when I begun this Letter, I had not had one Hour any Day to my ſelf, and which has cauſed me ſo many Avacations ſince, ſo that I have been obliged to defer ſending to you till this Day, *February* 27.

I am,

SIR,

Your Humble Servant,

Thomas Carte.

MR. *Baxter* and Dr. *Calamy*, to support their Charge against King *Charles*, depend chiefly (as appears from their words quoted in this Letter) on two wretched Authorities indeed; The one is a Letter, said to be produced in the House of Commons in *England*, by the Marquess of *Antrim*; The other is the Pamphlet, called *Murder will out*; Concerning which, I am to observe that I have search'd for both, with all the diligence I could use, but without success; This is what I might well expect, with regard to the former, since Dr. *Calamy* expresses himself about it in such a manner,* that it looks as if he was Conscious that there was no such Letter in being.

And with regard to the Letter, I only get this Account, which is given by Mr. *Long*, in his Review of *Baxter*'s Life, p. 207. That it is a scandalous Libel, written by one of the Regicides, and (as he thinks) by *Ludlow*, and published after the Revolution, when that infamous Wretch dared to return into *England*, in hopes of the protection of the Government, when in his, and other Pamphlets were published about the same time, all the Lies and Calumnies that had been ever raised of the Royal Family were reviv'd; and what regard such an Authority deserves, let any judge.

How far it is from deserving any in the present dispute, I have shewn already, in the Letter I sent to Mr. *Chandler* on *February* 27, from whom I have ever since waited for an Answer, but that perhaps is what I have no reason to expect. I might however at least hope for his thanks for giving him that proof of the King's Innocence which he had not seen, and called upon me to direct him to; This being what himself has offer'd, and bid me to expect. And whoever considers his seeming regard to the doing the Royal Martyr Justice, † his Protestation that he should be heartily glad to find the Calumny disproved, his giving me assurance that he would not dissemble any Satisfaction that is given him, his solemn Declaration in the presence of God, that he would heartily thank me for directing him to a Refutation of this Story, will think that these were encouragements enough to hope for thus much from him. For can it be imagined that such Protestations, such solemn appeals to God should mean nothing, and be attended with no effect? We know indeed what end they served, and what their meaning was in 1648: But sure those times are not returned, surely Men will not now dare to deal freely with God and his Providence, or make their appeals to him with that Hypocrisy which was practised then: One would in Charity hope that their assurances might be somewhat more to be depended on, and their declarations in the Presence of God, made with more sincerity of Heart. But at present in the Case before us, we can only hope this. 'Tis performance must give us assurance of it, and the longer

---

* Abridgement *of* Baxter's *Life*, *p.* 44. Edit. 1713. † *See his* 2 *Letters.*

longer that is delay'd, the weaker our hopes muſt be. For as Mr. *Chandler* cannot but know that Juſtice to the Martyr's Memory, (an obligation which with a needleſs care he has put me in mind of) requires him to publiſh his Satisfaction in the proofs of his Innocence that have been laid before him; ſo his deſires likewiſe (if they are hearty, as he pretends they be) of ſeeing the Impious Calumny diſproved, will not ſuffer him to delay this a Moment, will not let him diſſemble his Satisfaction longer.

As for his promiſe of Thanks to my ſelf, that, as far as is in my Power, I willingly releaſe him, only deſiring that Satisfaction may be made for the Injury done to King *Charles*'s Memory, as the moſt pleaſing return that can be made to me. His obligations to this, are too plain to be denied, and (may I hope! they) are too ſtrong to be got for ever, and ſince I need not with Mr. *Chandler* more a knowledge than he has of his Duty, how to act in this Caſe, let me at leaſt with him an Heart to perform it.

To provide however againſt a neglect, and to ſupply what has been hitherto wanting on his Part, I have taken this method to vindicate the King's Honour, and refute the charge againſt him; A method which ſeems the more neceſſary, becauſe this ſtory of the Marqueſs of *Antrim* is referr'd to as an eſtabliſhed Truth, as an Authentick piece of Hiſtory in p. 7 of a late Pamphlet, *entituled a Letter from a Gentleman at* Dunkirk *to a Nobleman in* London, who from what is ſaid, p. 21 appears to be a Biſhop.

I have but one thing more to add, which is, that I hope, if the Reader meets with any uncorrectneſs of expreſſion in my 2 Letters, the haſte and circumſtances in which I wrote them, may be allowed as an excuſe for it. But as for the main of the Argument, I deſire no favour, for if I had not thought it clear, ſhould not have troubled the World with it; And I cannot think this Nation yet ſo generally poiſoned with ill principles, or to have ſo little ſenſe of gratitude to King *Charles*, or regard for his Memory, as not to receive favourably a vindication of him, or to make it needful to uſe any other Apology for publiſhing it.

BATH, May 12. 1714.

Postcript.

SINCE it grates hard on human Nature, (such is the corruption of it,) to recant any error, and scarce any thing is a greater tryal of a Man's humility, and regard to Truth and Justice, to dispose Mr. *Chandler* the more readily to a Publick vindication of King *Charles* from the charge against him, and to an ingenious Acknowledgment of his Error, and of the falshood of his Prejudices in that point, let me recommend to him the Example of some of his own Brethren, not only that of Mr. *Henderson*, whose Recantation and Repentance are already Publick enough, and whose Memory is valued nothing more than for this part of his Conduct; but that likewise of Mr. *Vines*, a very celebrated Man among the Presbyterians in the Time of the Rebellion; of whose Sentiments of King *Charles* after the Treaty at *Uxbridge*, take this Account as it was given about the Year 1675 by Mr. *Nathaniel Gilbert* of *Coventry* in an Information subscribed by his own hand; The original whereof is in the Custody of my Father now living in *Leicester*, and Minister of the Church of St. *Martins* there, to to whose Grand mother the said Mr. *Nathaniel Gilbert* was half Brother there, and what I here publish, is taken from an attested Copy of it, now lying before me.

When Mr. *Vines* returned from the Treaty at *Uxbridge*, Mr. *Walden* being at *London* with Mr. *Nathaniel Gilbert*, News was brought to them, that Mr. *Vines* was returned, wherenpon they both went to Mr. *Vines*, who, after usual Ceremonies between Friends, said with great affection, Brother *Walden*, How hath this Nation been fooled? We have been told that our King was a Child and a Fool; But if I understand any thing by my converse with him, which I have had with great liberty, he is as much of a Christian Prince, as ever I read or heard of since our Saviour's time; He also said he is a very precious Prince, and is able of himself to argue with the ablest Divines we have.

Item That we gave such undeniable reasons for Episcopacy, &c. that the World could not answer them, that he had convinced him that it was agreeable to the Primitive Times.

As for his (meaning the King's) Clergy, there is no fence against their Flails, they are a great deal too hard for us.

That this, and much more to the same purpose was affirmed by Mr. *Vines* to Mr *Walden* is attested by *Nathaniel Gilbert*.

Among the other things affirmed by Mr. *Vines*, my Father well remembers Mr. *Gilbert* told him this expression of his in relation to the King, *viz. That among all the Kings of* Israel *and* Judah, *there was none like him.*

FINIS.